Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 22 Jul 93   Volume 93 : Issue 247

Today's Topics:
                        Call sign changes
                  Give a VE $5.60, walk (3 msgs)
               Order pizza on your autopatch now
                    PRB-1 and the ARRL (3 msgs)
      STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep! (2 msgs)
                    The ARRL is NOT "Newington!"
                         TS50 Illegal!

>>   (Kevin Sanders) writes:

>>:Talk about embarassing phonetics, my call (about 8 months old now) is
>>:KN6FQ. You don't even need phonetics to make that one sound obscene
>>:over the air!

>>Kevin, send in a form 610 form requesting a new call sign, attach a

>>copy of your license and the simple statement that you find the
>>one assigned to you to cause you embarrassment. It works.

No need to explain WHY you want a new call sign. Just check the box on Form
610. The FCC will assign you a new call sign at random from the block
currently being used in your district for your license class. The Commission
doesn't care why you want it changed.
 """
 Brian Battles, WS1O   I Tel   203-666-1541, ext 222 I "Radio amateurs
 QST Features Editor   I Fax   203-665-7531   I   do it with
 ARRL HQ   I Internet bbattles@arrl.org   I great frequency"
 Newington, CT USA   I Amprnet ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org   I
 "" .

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 93 03:47:07 EDT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!wariat.org!
nraven!floyd@ames.arpa
Subject: Give a VE $5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

One more thing before I forget:

In a few years No-Coders will be the "*majority*" or
amateur radio operators. Maybe if the old hams like yourself
would try and assist in upgrading and teaching these amateurs,
they'd do the same after and the amateur VHF spectrum might be
a much nicer place.

73 de N8VUR

__Douglas A. Dever__   floyd@nraven.wariat.org

All Flames to: s9000159@llohio.ll.pbs.org

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 93 03:23:45 EDT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!wariat.org!nraven!floyd@ames.arpa
Subject: Give a VE $5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>
> Amen! At long last another voice speaks the truth. Yeah, its not
> politically correct, and no doubt you're going to receive a ton of

> flame mail attempting to berate you, but rest assured that there
> are thousands of amateurs out there who agree with you. In fact,
> I daresay that the *majority* of radio amatuers (excluding the no-
> clues, that is) would agree with you, except that they would have
> to deal with the harassing flame mail if they did.
>

        Actually.. I agree with you that VHF has become trash. But
I'm a no-coder. I got into the amateur service because I respected
the people who did the public service work and I wanted to assist.
I try to be the best possible amateur I can be on the air and hope
that some of these idiots will follow my lead. I explain things
that I thought were common sense (ie net protocol) to new amateurs
who seem clueless and it's too damn bad that the people like you
who are the experts and have been doing this for years aren't
the ones doing a damned thing! (Of course it was common sense to
me because I lisened for 5 years before I ever got licensed.
At least when I jumped in, I already had a good idea of how things
were and what i was getting into.... it's too bad so many peple
people rather, don't bother to do just that, listen.)
>
> Of course, amateur radio organizations like the ARRL are to blame
> as well. Especially those that supported the no-code license, and
> the VECs who are "dumbing down" the theory tests to "make it easier".
> Their motto: Quantity before Quality. After all, quantity means
> more memberships. More memberships means a greater circulation base
> for QST, and a greater circulation base means greater advertising
> revenues.
>

        I guess you're not to blame, right? I mean after all..
you've voiced your dissent and you lost. Instead of doing anything
to improve the situation and make good amateurs out of people, you'd
rather just sit back and pout about it. Gee, what a difference you're
making! Did you ever think maybe if you called one of these amateurs
and bothered to take the time to answer a few questions and possibly
teach them a thing or two about being amateurs you'd end up with a
better amateur after the call? Or are you simply too good for that?
>
>
>
> 146.700 is the local "no-clue" hangout. Unfortunately, its also the
> repeater with the best coverage (virtually the entire state of RI)
> so I guess its prone to that sort of thing.

That I can sympathize with. We have a local machine on the West
Side of Cleveland and it has great coverage. 146.88   Unfortunatly
I don't think it deserves a freq. anymore... I think Channel 88

would be much more fitting for it. But, if the club trustees want
to tolerate that crap, I'm just not going to bother renewing.

I know that the 146.82 club, The Cuyahoga Amateur Radio Society, of which
I'm a member also, just dosen't tolerate that type of on-air
behavior. And you know what? They don't have the problems that
Channel 88 does. I guess it just depends on if the club trustees care
about their machine, or if they would rather just be politically
correct and say "Oh well... he's an amateur too, and I wouldn't
want to offend him." That's what happens when I bunch of lawyers
run a club, I guess.
> Do not despair. Other amateurs recognize this fact. Some of them are
> forming local organizations designed to keep the no-clue scum out of
> the local scene. For example, the Rhode Island 2x2 Amateur Repeater
> Association has a $4,000 membership application fee for no-clues.
> Novices are $2,000, Generals $1,000, Advanced $500, and Extra $250.
> People who upgrade within a year of joining get a refund between the
> difference.

        Oh yeah.. that must really be one hell of a solution there.
In that case the entire 2X2 club ought to just send their calls
back. Elitest crap like that belong back on the Children's
Band which you so despise. (Although I doubt you'd have any
problems fitting in on CB)
>
>
> Don't be fooled by the virulent pro-no-cluers here. This is USENET.
> Bastillion of the liberal mentality borne from the Universities at
> which is was founded. Their welfare-state mentality of making it
> "fair" for everyone means the eventual elimination of all requirements.
> Already the no-cluers are crying for HF privs. Pretty soon, just open
> the box, take out your radio and your license, and get on the air.
>
> MD

        Well, Rev., actually I'm not crying for HF privleges. In fact
I'm against having HF without code. And I'm no-code. I think
the ITU requirement is a good one, and should still be required
for operation on HF. Besides, the guys with code do a good enough
job ruining it in the US, they don't need anyone elses help. (14.313)
Besides, only in the US to you get to hear to obscene drunken stupors
of the amateurs late night on 15 or 20 meters.

Oh BTW- I'm hard-core conservative and proud of it. I am not trying
to just flame you. I think you have valid points, but I don't think
you go about them in the right manner. I thought that amateurs

were friendly people always willing to help. If I want elitest
bullshit I'll go out and buy a Children's Band rig.

It's just too bad that the most you can do to help the situation
is sit back and whine because the world isn't how you want it to
be.

73 de N8VUR

__Douglas A. Dever__   floyd@nraven.wariat.org

All Flames to: s9000159@llohio.ll.pbs.org

Date: 22 Jul 93 14:27:15 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE $5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hmmm...did you ever consider that there are nitwits in every hobby, business
and pursuit? I don't suggest you give up trying to improve things in a
positive, constructive way...just don't let it get to you!

GL, OM!

CUL es 73 de BB
 ""
 Brian Battles, WS1O   I Tel   203-666-1541, ext 222 I "Radio amateurs
 QST Features Editor   I Fax   203-665-7531   I   do it with
 ARRL HQ   I Internet bbattles@arrl.org   I great frequency"
 Newington, CT USA   I Amprnet ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org   I
 """ .

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 19:14:19 +0000
From: pipex!bnr.co.uk!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul20.072456.25176@cyphyn.UUCP> randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:
> floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:
> : dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:
> :
> : > Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal
> : > anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and
> : > abolish CW next :-)

```
> : >
> :
> : Naw!  They'll move on from that and try to recall all the no-code
> : licenses!  :)
> :
>
>  I guess you guys didn't hear about that new petition going around, that
> wants to remove all 'phone from 160--10 meters, and have only CW .
>
>
Now that sounds like a *good* idea! Can I record a yes vote? :-)

Dave


*****************************************************************************
* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25     *    You think *you* have problems?   *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk  Internet *    What do you do if you *are*      *
* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org      Amprnet  *     a manically depressed robot??   *
*****************************************************************************


------------------------------

Date: 22 Jul 93 02:05:04 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!wupost!udel!news.intercon.com!panix!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: PRB-1 and the ARRL
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

n2ic@longs.att.com (Steve London) writes:
>
>Despite assurances from my esteemed ARRL director, I see that the recent
>failures of PRB-1 were not an important topic at the recent ARRL Board
>of Directors meeting (see ARRL Bulletin 075, posted on
>rec.radio.amateur.misc).
>


The ARRL bulletins are short "headlines" when it comes to board meetings,
and are not written by the board.  Why not wait until the actual meeting
minutes come out before flaming?

-Andy-
--
        _____ Andrew Funk, KB7UV _____
        |     Chair, Radio Amateur Telecommunications Society (RATS)    |
        | ENG Editor/Microwave Control, WCBS-TV Channel 2 News, New York |
        | Internet: kb7uv@panix.com     Packet: kb7uv@kb7uv.#nli.ny.usa |
```

----

ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, n2ic@longs.att.com (Steve London) writes:
>
>>When are these Newington geniuses going to get their heads screwed on
>   ^^^^^^^^^
>>straight ?
>
>Please remember that the Board of Directors is NOT from Newington! One
>of each is elected in each Division. The staff has no influence over
>what is discussed at a Board meeting or its outcome.

So do we write our division managers and ask why PRB-1 apparently means
nothing to the courts and silly awards merit mentioning in an ARRL
bulletin? Certainly the staff must hear what's going on, and I have to
believe Chris Imlay knows what's going on. So is the Board of Directors in
the dark and need of enlightenment? Or do they believe antenna
restrictions aren't a big deal? Perhaps they feel as one avid contester I
exchanged mail with feels, which is that if you're serious about this
hobby, then move to where there aren't restrictions. To which I say,
"BALONEY".

Tell me where to write. I'm warming up the PC now...

73,
Todd
N9MWB

----

n2ic@longs.att.com (Steve London) writes:

>
>
> When are these Newington geniuses going to get their heads screwed on

```
> straight ?
>
>
> Steve London, N2IC/0


        When either, everyone stops joining and/or dosen't renew.
(that would be my catagory)

        Or those who wanted to be members would simply quit checking
the box with the incumbants name because they don't care as long
as they can send cute little cards for talking and saying nothing.
You know the type of conversations I'm refering to.. the ones
I listen to on a reciever all the time:

        My Call is <whatever>
        My Name is <whatever>
        I am located <wherever>
        My rig is <whatever>
        I'm using a <whatever> antenna
        It's 80 degrees and sunny here


Gee.. makes me want to run right out and buy HF gear, ya know?

-------------------------------

Date: 22 Jul 93 13:32:58 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Can you guys say W5YI???

let's not and say that we did.  I'm pretty sure that Fred isn't handling
anywhere near the numbers of exams the ARRL is...but i don't see his numbers
and only can infer from the shadows cast by other data.  when i last talked to
a couple of guys in orlando and we compared notes, it looks like W5YI or ARRL
will appear identical to the candidate.  W5YI has bigger CSCE forms.

>I'll bet you can now! :)   Unfortunatly most of us have learned the hard
>way that you don't want an ARRL VE to be involved in your upgrading, or
>initial licensing......

back when all this was getting started 9-10 years ago, the ARRL was the group
interested in servicing these little back water areas like Melbourne,FL.  one
reason the ARRL/VEC group was a "popular" group to sign up for was the other
groups were looking for application fees, didn't want anyone but Extra, etc.
```

trivia question...when you took your test and had the subsequent delays, was
the group running the tests a group that runs them on some sort of frequent
schedule? we do an exam a month on the 3rd saturday. sure beats 4x/year,
during the work day during the week first thing in the morning at a site
5-6 hours away.

I'll also say that there's a lot that can go wrong with the paper work or with
the materials supplied by the candidate. this is the stuff that makes people
not want to be liasions 8).

In the group's experience here, we've found the ARRL/VEC to be helpful to a
fault - and the local turnaround is about 6-8 weeks as expected. I send the
stuff in AirBorne as requested by the ARRL - usually I can drop it off by the
afternoon of the exams but certainly by Sunday after the tests.

I don't think that you can run an input sort to make 2 piles (new vs. upgrade)
because tomorrow you get another shipment. you have to try to clean the input
hopper every day. I know it doesn't work for the mail room here where there's
a break made for "mail" vs. "boxes". We found recently that there was always
enough "mail" coming in that the mail clerks never got around to opening the
boxes in a timely fashion and the mail in there was as much as 4 months old
(stuff shipped cross country gets converted to a bulk form and then handled by
a carrier like UPS). the mail clerks still swear they were "just about to
open" them when this stuff was discovered. right.

You want to have the level of comfort be a full outbox and a clean inbox with
no trouble reports (something's wrong with an application) outstanding. You
don't want the processing folks to be happy with a 4" high stack of paper as
"backlog". the FCC has the same problems as well since they always seem to be
at 6-8 weeks delay -- if they ever caught up to zero on the pendings then the
turnaround should drop significantly. Of course things like minimum batch
size and physical movement of forms limit how much time can be cut.

>And just think!!! They're going to take over some of the licensing
>aspects..... hmm, I hope no one want a club call for the next decade or
>so...

if you can put together the organization and make a good proposal to the FCC
for you be to be club licensing guru, you could probably get it. there's
nothing to say the ARRL is going to win by default.

73, bill wb9ivr

Date: 22 Jul 93 13:45:25 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net

Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, levin@bbn.com (Joel B Levin) writes:
>In article <CAIpCC.MsL@dartvax.dartmouth.edu>, Kenneth.E.Harker@Dartmouth.Edu
(Kenneth E. Harker) writes:
>|> And I was actually considering joining the ARRL myself, but now I don't
>|> think so. I would offer to pay more than $5.60 for the handling, but I
>|> don't think that would help, really. I mean, my $5.60 is enough money
>|> to pay a college intern to devote _an entire hour_ to my application
>|> alone. If it can't get double checked and forwarded on to the FCC
>|> within an hour, there's something really wrong with the ARRL.
>
>I suppose you think the VEC is there to process just your application.
>Do you know how many they receive? I think they are probably quick
>enough in average times; but they are subject to peaks just like
>anyone else, and it's possible that when the mail brings in several
>large VE sessions' worth of applications at once it takes more than a
>little while to get through them.
>
>I don't know if an hour per application is reasonable, either; there
>is a lot of careful checking and logging that goes on, and they go
>through every piece of paper that comes with each 610 and VE session;
>session logs and summary sheets, and for each 610 there are
>photocopies of existing licenses and CSCEs, the graded test sheets,
>and new CSCEs issued.
>
>On the other hand I read the rules to mean that 610s should leave the
>VEC for the FCC within ten days of arrival at the VEC, regardless of
>how quick the VE team was.

Thanks, Joel. You've hit the nail on the head.

We do have peak times here at the ARRL/VEC. One is routinely
April/May/June--with November and December also a peak, but to a lesser
degree.

Given that a VE Team may up to ten days at their end, add on three days
(on average) for mailing to the VEC, and assuming that we took our
full ten days, two to three weeks time can be involved before the
application reaches the FCC. During testing peaks, we have had to use
our full ten days.

And yes, each answer sheet, code copy sheet, 610, CSCE (previous and current),
and any other document(s) for each applicant are reviewed. Nearly each
license copy has to be trimmed and attached to the 610, as the FCC requires.
Attendance averages twelve applicants per session, with a routine number
of sessions including 25 to 40 applicants or more.

A file is then created for test forms. Session summary results are entered
into a computer. The VE Team's credentials are verified. An FCC summary
form is created/copied for forwarding/filing. And so on...

Year around, we probably average four to six days processing time.
Sometimes more, per above, and sometimes less. As for us turning
an exam the same day received, we'd like to do that--but
we aren't able to do so at present. Of course, whenever
the FCC goes beyond six weeks themselves, one-third of our staff
find themselves answering inquiries from applicants regarding the
whereabouts of their license. This is often six to seven weeks into the
process. We would be glad to have those staff members processing
sessions too...

Informationally, we have given each ARRL VE Team (and VE) an information
sheet--that they are to hand out to applicants--which covers the typical
wait for a license (specified at about ten weeks from the test date). We
verbally indicate eight to ten weeks to callers.

The FCC quotes 90 days. If an inquiry is made by an applicant to
the FCC before 90 days have elapsed, the FCC will sometimes advise that
the caller check back at 90 days--or, if the license has not been issued,
they will review their computer records and, if nothing is found, they
will give their *standard* response, "We have no record of that application!"

Great response, eh? Well, the FCC only records on their computer
the fact that an application is at their facility when it is actually
keyboarded.

When is it keyboarded? The 2nd to the last step in their process--which
is on a Tuesday (about five to seven weeks after they have received).

What is the last step? Two days later (the same week, on that Thursday), the
license is laser printed and mailed. You then receive it via first-class mail
within the next few days.

73,

Bart J. Jahnke, KB9NM
Manager
ARRL/VEC

Date: 22 Jul 93 14:13:16 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The ARRL is NOT "Newington!"

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:
>n2ic@longs.att.com (Steve London) writes:

>> When are these Newington geniuses going to get their heads screwed on
>> straight ?
>>
>> Steve London, N2IC/0

   Hey! I work at ARRL HQ in Newington, Connecticut! And I don't make League
policy here (nor does anyone else here). It's determined by the Board of
Directors, who are your elected volunteer representatives. Complain to
them--their addresses and telephone numbers are on page 8 of every issue of
QST. If they don't respond the way you wish, then: (1) Accept the fact that
in a democratic organization, someone doesn't always get his way on
everything (2) Vote for a new Director in the next election, or (3) Run for
Director yourself.

   Quitting the ARRL means that: (1) You're no longer entitled to officially
complain about ARRL policies or actions because you're no longer a voting
"constituent" of your Division Director, (B) You don't support the only
organization that's at all effective in representing Amateur Radio interests
in government, and (C) You're satisfied to "ride the coattails" of your fellow
hams who are active paid-up Members by enjoying the same on-air privileges and
services the ARRL works to establish and protect.

   Just my personal thoughts on the matter. But please knock off busting on
"the (epithets) in Newington" when you mean to say "the ARRL Board of
Directors" or "we ARRL Members."

CUL es 73 de BB

NOTE: ALTHOUGH I AM EMPLOYED AS A PAID STAFF MEMBER AT ARRL HQ, THE COMMENTS
ABOVE IN NO WAY REFELCT OFFICIAL ARRL POLICIES, OPINIONS OR POSITIONS. THEY
ARE ENTIRELY MY OWN PRIVATE, PERSONAL VIEWS.
 """
 Brian Battles, WS1O   I Tel   203-666-1541, ext 222 I "Radio amateurs
 QST Features Editor   I Fax   203-665-7531   I   do it with
 ARRL HQ   I Internet bbattles@arrl.org   I great frequency"
 Newington, CT USA   I Amprnet ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org   I
 """
 """
 Brian Battles, WS1O   I Tel   203-666-1541, ext 222 I "Radio amateurs
 QST Features Editor   I Fax   203-665-7531   I   do it with
 ARRL HQ   I Internet bbattles@arrl.org   I great frequency"
 Newington, CT USA   I Amprnet ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org   I

"".

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1993 07:55:34 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!emory!
kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: TS50 Illegal!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul21.120648.20463@hemlock.cray.com> dadams@cray.com writes:
>
>Well last time I read the part of the regulation that covers CB it was
>apparent that if you did not have a valid Amateur Radio License then it
>was illegal to own non-type accepted CB equipment, or an amplifier
>capable of amplifying CB frequencies. The regulation specifically states
>that possesion is considered evidence of use.
>
>I wish the rule were ammended to allow licenced Amateurs the privelege to
>use 11 meters (as secondary users, of course) also allowing them to
>contact other legitimate users of those frequencies. (In other words
>I think that it is really silly to have to have two radios in the car
>to work 10 and 11 meters. If the TS-50 can do both, why not allow it
>to do so if the user is a licenced Ham as long as he abides the 4 watt
>pep rule etc? Scenario--You are traveling cross country with relatives.
>They are not licenced hams but do have CBs. Why should you not be able
>to stay in touch simply because you have a license? Or why should you
>have to have two radios installed when one would do nicely?) Couldn't
>some reasonable agreement be worked out here?

It seems reasonable, but it would probably be an enforcement nightmare.
The FCC doesn't want any equipment out there that can be easily modified
to exceed CB maximums. A ham rig almost certainly would exceed CB maximums
on other bands, and would likely be difficult to design so it couldn't
be simply modified to do so on CB. That would give the FCC real type
acceptance headaches. Then too there's a regulatory resistance to allowing
cross service contacts. The FCC is already concerned about VHF/UHF
equipment that can operate outside the amateur bands, even as receivers.
See the current scanner inquiry where the FCC asks for coment on the
feasibility of requiring ham equipment to *not* be able to be modified
for out of band reception. Also see the banning of *converters* that
would enable cellular frequencies to be translated to a band where
scanners are allowed. Now that's *simple* technology that's going
to be almost impossible to enforce.

The FCC would like to build a brick wall around 11 meters and forget
it exists. Mixing in hams too would be a significant weakening of
that wall. Many would say that the FCC is taking the wrong approach

with CB, scanners, and cellular phone privacy. I certainly think
that they are. But that's the way they're going, and it'd be difficult
to change their direction because Congress wrote some of it into law.
My feeling is that the proper way to deal with scanners and cellular
phone is encryption of any messages that desire privacy. And my feeling
about CB is that licensing and enforcement shouldn't have been abandoned.
But they have been, and putting the snakes back in the bottle isn't likely
to happen.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #247
****